



Docket No.: 240302US0

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/618,693
Applicants: Hiroyuki KISO, et al.
Filing Date: July 15, 2003
For: CATALYST AND PROCESS FOR PRODUCING A
RIGID POLYURETHANE FOAM
Group Art Unit: 1711
Examiner: COONEY, John M.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

Response to Restriction Requirement

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon

Donald K. Drummond, Ph.D.

Registration No. 52,834

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)

(703) 413-2220 (fax)

DOCKET NO: 240302US0



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
HIROYUKI KISO, ET AL. : EXAMINER: COONEY, JOHN M.
SERIAL NO: 10/618,693 :
FILED: JULY 15, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1711
FOR: CATALYST AND PROCESS FOR :
PRODUCING A RIGID POLYURETHANE
FOAM

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated December 13, 2004, Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I: Claims 1-4, drawn to urethanizing catalyst for examination.

REMARKS

The Examiner is requiring restriction of the above-identified application as follows:

Group I: Claims 1-4, drawn to urethanizing catalyst, and

Group II: Claims 5-9, drawn to isocyanurizing catalyst.

Applicants have elected with traverse, Group I: Claims 1-4 drawn to urethanizing catalyst for examination.

Restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are independent or patentably distinct and there would be a serious burden placed on the examiner if restriction is not required (M.P.E.P. § 803). The burden of proof is on the Examiner to provide reasons